

THE SOUTHERNER.

THE SOUTHERNER.

TARBOROUGH:

MAY 22, 1852.

FOR GOVERNOR,

DAVID S. REID.

DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION.

We are forced to postpone the publication of the proceedings of this Convention until next week. D. S. Reid is our Candidate. The Convention unanimously selected him. The platform is a full specification of and a determined adherence to the old Democratic principles. No question is dodged, but all fairly and directly met. A re-affirmation of Free Suffrage by the next Legislature, and the approval of it by the people, so as to engraft it in the Constitution, advocated. The compromise acquiesced in.

With such frank, open-handed measures, our party must surely overcome the ambiguous, all-sided proceedings of its opponents. The people were too shamefully humbugged in the last Presidential election—the mortification has sunk too deep into their minds for them to become so soon the willing dupes of such political jugglery.

THE WHIG NOMINEE—THE TIMES.

It is strange indeed, that persons will sustain with vehemence principles when expressed in soft, euphonious terms, and yet so violently repudiate every harsh or unpopular phrase which expresses their inevitable consequences. For instance, the "Times" does not deny, nay, it quotes with pleasure, the recorded determination of the Whig nominee to "maintain the cause of liberty—identified as it is with the Union of the States," and yet when we remarked, in substance, that Mr. Kerr considered the Union as of paramount importance to State Rights, its advocacy as being the only test of patriotism, he flares up and insinuates that we are becoming ferocious. Really it seems to us, that if Mr. Kerr and the editor of the Times look on Union & Liberty, as inseparable in their destiny, as *identified* in importance, they would, though perhaps reluctantly, sacrifice the dearest sectional or State Rights for their preservation—that they would submit to any act of Congress, however oppressive to the South, which could be brought within the most fanatical, imaginative stretch of the powers conferred by the Constitution, rather than dissolve the—Liberty, which we enjoy. As for our part, we fear the day may yet come, when the destruction of the Union will be necessary to the preservation of Liberty. God grant that it never may. Yet, our prayer must prove effectual, if the Whig party of North Carolina does not define some point, at which they will be willing to defend our rights against the continuous aggressions of the North, even at the sacrifice of the Union. If they do not discontinue their support of candidates, who look on the Union and Liberty as identical, and who attempt to stamp the stigma of treason on any ebullition of over-weening love for Southern Rights. Let the Whig Party come up manfully and declare their willingness to unite with the Democrats, even on the compromise, as the point where aggression must stop, and the Southerner will no more be heard introducing the question in a State Campaign, or calling on its readers to vote against a determined submissionist.

The "Times" understands us, as "censuring Mr. Kerr for opposing the Nashville Convention." Our remarks were directed against the principle of the nominee (Liberty and Union as one and the same), and not such petty manifestation of it as the one alluded to. Secession is what we stated he denounced as treason. Our "proof," real Kerr-whig, we would have given, had not the Times furnished us sufficient. And when the editor would again defend his candidate against the charge of being an ultra Unionist, we would advise him neither to laud, in the same article, "his chivalrous action against the abominable heresies"—secession and State Rights, nor to record his own determination to give one vote just for that—for we resume the vote of

one who declares that "he does not believe in that 'old fogie' Thomas Jefferson and his Resolutions of '98 and '99—who never believed in old 'Nat Meekins' nor Andrew Jackson—who will never trust a Disunionist of the Nashville Convention treason,"—will not be very apt to disprove any assertion of Mr. Kerr's want of State Rights principle.

The second article, the editor of the "Times" surely penned under the low pressure of a good dinner, or he made a "happy" sacrifice of the meaning of the quotation which he inserts, to an exhibition of his wit. As either is pardonable, we explain. We wished to convey the idea, that as the editor was in the Convention, he of course understood the motive which prompted, and the purpose for which the resolution was passed, and as he claimed it as a declaration in favor of a free-convention, a presumption, violent if not conclusive, arose, that it was so intended by the Convention. Such being the case, we ask again, even under the ban of the editor's witty criticism, can eastern men support the candidate who adopted it? We believe, they are too conscientious.

A word about the editor's hit at us, as a secessionist. If the editor means, that we believe in the power of a State Government to nullify a law of the General Government or to declare a State cut off from the Union, he is totally mistaken in our principles. Far from it. But we do believe, ay, we know that the General Government and the State Government both take their authority, so far as the people of North Carolina are concerned, from the exercised sovereignty of the people of the State in Convention assembled. That both are creatures of the same. And that whenever, in like manner and form, they choose to exercise it again, the allegiance to it will be superior, paramount to the allegiance to either government. Whether or not, the General Government, as the agent of the other States would have in such an emergency, the right of coercion, is another question. If it would, the right could have no other than a like foundation to that of enforcing treaty stipulations. The citizens acting under the primitive sovereignty of the State could by no means, be treated as traitors; for it is preposterous to suppose that statesmen intended that there should practically be either double or triple treason; and to such a result, the opposite doctrine would inevitably lead.

FREE SUFFRAGE.

We have neither time nor space to investigate fully the subject. We will however give in as concise and comprehensive terms, as we can command, the reason why we advocate it. While we believe, that the representation of property should be a fundamental principle in Government economy, we as firmly think, that like every other interest, independent of personal rights, it should command no more consideration than just enough for its certain protection. Why? Because of the vast superiority of man over property. The simple question therefore arises, would free suffrage leave property sufficiently protected? If so, we are for it. If not, we are against it. We are fully convinced that it would. If the proposition,—that the numerical majority, viz. the non-land-holders, control the election was not as *practically* false as it is theoretically plausible,—there might be a doubt. And if experience had not invariably proved—that men (these representatives would be land holders) when they have a species, and of course much more so, if they have a genuine excuse (they would be elected as representatives of property) always cling to their interests,—there might be some ground for opposition. But when we know that the landholders, usually spoken of as the influential men, regulate virtually the election of our officers; and even were such not the case, that their interest in property would surely preserve it from oppression, we cannot see how any one can believe that there is the most remote probability of the property interest being sacrificed. If then free suffrage will not be productive of evil, will it also be non-productive of good. We think not. It will give to

the citizens of the State an apparent equality, though perhaps effectively worthless, yet surely consolatory. It will destroy an incentive to Mammon worship—prolific of avarice and selfishness. It will tend to eradicate that leaning to distinct, conventional castes in society, which every exclusive privilege is apt to engender. It will give, at least, a seeming dominion over the soil, a political interest in it, and cherish, thereby, State pride and patriotism. It will endear our Government, as more thoroughly just, more truly republican. These may be but "fanciful" benefits, yet they are such as mankind prize most highly. They are gratifying and productive of no harm, let them then be conceded.

THE PUMPS.

So soon forgetful of our dangers, ye guardians of the Town, that not a pump will furnish water. Look to your duties, or we fear the brilliant commencement of your administration, will lead to such utter darkness, as to require illumination; and then if the pumps be dry, woe unto your future fame.

CR. SECTION.

We have made a correction in the advertisement of the Seaboard and Roanoke Rail Road Company, the Fare to the Baltimore Convention being \$9 50, instead of \$9, as erroneously stated in our last paper. We also learn that the new bridge at Weldon is completed, and the trains passing over it daily.

Also, in that of the Tredegar Locomotive Works, to which we again invite attention.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Fourth of July.

The citizens of Tarboro' and the county generally, are earnestly requested to meet at the Court House on Saturday, the 29th of May, at 10 o'clock A. M., for the purpose of making necessary arrangements for the celebration of the Anniversary of our National Independence. Come all.

MANY CITIZENS.

FOR THE SOUTHERNER.

Mr. Editor: I have received a letter bearing the names of A. C. Kingsland, Jno. C. Green, Fred. A. Talmadge and others, whig committee of New York, dated March 16th, '52. The letter no doubt was sent to a whig friend in N. C., who has turned traitor to the confidence placed in him, and enveloped the same to (me.) Sparta, N. C. It bears no post mark from where it was mailed. This confidential scamp of theirs, has betrayed his whig friends and cheated me out of five cents postage.

Poor fellow! I am sorry for him and regret that he cannot find a better employment. I have a plenty of work to do, and at this time my stalls, hen house, and privy need cleaning out, and if he will come and go to work, I will give him a dollar a day to do it. His friends in New York wish to hear from him, therefore I will inform them that the whigs in the South can't come it—that fanaticism has and will drive them to defend the Constitution and its guarantees, and the rights of the South—that their rights are dearer to them than party, or Daniel Webster; and until the people of the North learn to mete out justice to the Southern States, and defend the constitutional guarantees, and meddle not with State rights and the institutions of the South, they will call in vain to their Southern friends.

Already Messrs. Mangum and Stanly of N. C. have turned tail on the whig administration of Mr. Fillmore and the national whig party, and have united with their allies, Seward, free soil, and abolitionism, to elevate Gen. Scott to the Presidency; and are willing to impair and tarnish the strength of the whig party by uniting with their allies above, who have no principles only the prostitution of law, order, and the Constitution, and thereby have driven the Southern wing of the whig party from them. And I can see no good reason why this New York committee are not driven from them also, unless they are demagoguing to deceive their Southern brethren. We shall see.

WM. THIGPEN.

FOR THE SOUTHERNER.

Mr. Howard: When I wrote the communication, which I handed you for publication last week, I did not think of resuming the subject, unless in my estimation, circumstances made it necessary; but further reflection, has changed that determination. I shall now enter more into a detail, of the probable

practical results, of the proposed alteration of the Constitution, in the extension of the elective franchise.

I will remark here, that before this issue was made, for what purpose no one can doubt, the people of the Western part of the State, were satisfied, so far as I have been able to learn, with the "basis of representation," but as soon as "free suffrage," *alias* "equal suffrage" was agitated, they instituted a comparison between the inequality of the Eastern and Western representation, and many have now resolved, to insist upon its alteration; and whether they will succeed, or not, depends very much, perhaps entirely, on the determination which shall be made, of the "free-suffrage" question. Let me make this apparent. If the non-land-holders, shall be allowed equal political power, in the election of Senators, and shall desire to exercise it, nothing is to prevent their electing both the entire Senate and House of Commons. And as those of the West, certainly will, and many of the East, probably will believe, that an equality should exist in the representation, as well as in the elective franchise, what more natural, than the return, of the required majorities, to effect the object? Who, that admits the one, can consistently object to the other? If you say that property does not require representation, you admit the present "basis" is wrong; if property does require it, why should you give the power to the non-landholders to elect the Senators? But it may be said the Whigs as a party, are already in favor of an unrestricted Convention, to take in consideration all amendments. I am aware that most of the Whig leaders, profess to be opposed to the Legislative mode, and in favor of submitting to the people, the propriety of going into Convention, on all the proposed alterations, at "one fell swoop." While I believe that many of them are sincere, I cannot believe that a majority of them are so, in making this proposition. They desired no alteration before the Democratic party sprung the "free-suffrage" question, and as most of the Whigs were afraid to risk their popularity, by meeting it boldly and plainly, this Convention movement, is doubtless, a mere subterfuge. If they are unwilling to submit the one question, of "free-suffrage" to the people, (indirectly, though it be, in the first stages,) how are we to believe, that they wish to submit all the plans for amendment to them? Mark you, it will require the consent of two thirds of each branch of the Legislature, to call a Convention; so that a few more than one third of the free holders, or probably less than one sixth of the people, the voters of the State, may defeat it; and it is no doubt, deemed by those Whigs, the safest, if not surest course to pursue, to effect that object. Assuming then, for I think, I have established it, that a change in the "basis of representation," will speedily follow the extension of the right of Suffrage; let us look to some of the practical results. The West now having a large majority, in both branches of our Legislature, may make as many Rail, Plank and Turnpike-Roads as it shall desire; besides improving all such Rivers, as may be deemed worthy attempting; occasionally cutting a Canal &c: the East being unable to prevent it, as heretofore. The West will do the voting, pass the laws, and lay the taxes; the East, the property holders of the East, will have the privilege left, yes a little more than privilege, but less than pleasure, the onerous duty to discharge, of paying the most of said taxes! Have you any doubt of this result? Look at the consequence of the amendments, which were made to the Constitution in 1835; and you may judge from that little specimen, what these alterations, now contemplated, will effect.

Before then each county was entitled to one Senator and two Commons, besides this, seven borough representatives, five of them from the East constituted a part of the House of Commons. Then the Eastern part of the State had a majority in both branches of the Legislature; but after the alteration, aforesaid, limiting the number of Senators to fifty, and of Commons to one hundred and twenty; placing the former on the "basis" of "the public taxes," and the latter on "federal population," and abolishing the borough representation; although the East retained a small majority in the Senate, it was overpowered in the House, and the first decisive proof that was given, of our altered condition, was the fact, of the State's subscription for \$600,000 of stock, of the Wilmington & Raleigh Rail Road; and the next, in the endorsement of the bonds of the Raleigh & Gaston Rail Road Company for \$800,000, the most, or all of which she has had to assume, as her own liability; taking the Road itself, by way of balancing the interest on the debt. I speak from memory, but I believe these are substantially the facts.

Behold the gigantic schemes of Internal Improvements, in contemplation in this State, regardless of our present means to construct them, and of our want of population, and wealth to sustain them, by travel and Commerce; and say whether you are willing to give the West all the power of making them, and of taxing you at discretion for that purpose? Why is there so much more of taxation recently, than heretofore? You know it is chiefly to pay for Internal Improvements.

We are referred to the other States of this Confederacy, as our guide on this "free-suffrage" subject: I in turn, would refer you to their enormous public debts, created by making Internal Improvements; and ask you if their example, should not be avoided, rather than imitated?

Such is the natural result, of this unnatural state of things. There is no just responsibility; one class of the people, contracting debts, while another class has them to pay. When the Government is in the hands of the non-landholders, what is to prevent their making the lands pay all the taxes if they desire it? Not only that; what is to prevent them from dividing the lands of the State among the people? The doctrine that "thy nature every man is entitled to land," has its advocates among some of our would-be Presidents. Say you the Constitution prevents it? But they have the power of making the Constitution what they shall desire it to be.

Suppose among other things they should ever desire to abolish slavery in this State; they have only to engraft provision on the Constitution, conferring the power, and proceed to exercise it. But who believes, they will ever act so unjustly? I believe them to be as honest and as just, as the free holders; among them are some of my nearest relations and best friends, and I am willing to trust them as far, and with as much, as any discreet person would desire; but I am not willing to give them the power of controlling my lands. I make no charge against them, of bad intentions; they are no doubt as good as frail human nature, under similar circumstances, is capable. But I know not, they know not, what succeeding generations may desire; when all the leveling doctrines, now in their infancy, shall have grown to maturity. "Lead us not into temptation," should at all times, and under all circumstances, be our prayer.

It may be said, that should the supposed state of things ever occur the freeholders would resist by force, rather than submit to them. "An ounce of preventative, is worth a pound of cure," Take no steps that may lead to them. If they should resist however, what would be the result? Remember they will not only be in a minority of the people, but contending against the Government, to effect that object. Assuming then, for I think, I have established it, that a change in the "basis of representation," will speedily follow the extension of the right of Suffrage; let us look to some of the practical results. The West now having a large majority, in both branches of our Legislature, may make as many Rail, Plank and Turnpike-Roads as it shall desire; besides improving all such Rivers, as may be deemed worthy attempting; occasionally cutting a Canal &c: the East being unable to prevent it, as heretofore. The West will do the voting, pass the laws, and lay the taxes; the East, the property holders of the East, will have the privilege left, yes a little more than privilege, but less than pleasure, the onerous duty to discharge, of paying the most of said taxes! Have you any doubt of this result? Look at the consequence of the amendments, which were made to the Constitution in 1835; and you may judge from that little specimen, what these alterations, now contemplated, will effect.

you for giving the publication, and pleased, that you have replied to it. Will, I trust, prove the means of convincing the people, to give the subject deliberate consideration, which is a decidedly great importance demand.

Whether you have "severely" "chained," or proved its strength by "hammering," perhaps remains to be seen. If you had said, that not liking "chain" you had endeavored to make one of your own, you would no doubt have "hit the nail on the head," would advise all who may happen to have law suits, without facts to sustain them, to employ you, as if you could furnish fancy to answer as a substitute I know not who can. The "issues" tempted to make, seem not to suit, as you have so modified them that hardly know their "favor."

Perhaps your "issues" were more *met* than mine. I stated as a fact, which you have not, and cannot dispute, that this "free-suffrage" question, did not originate with the people, that a grievance exists, & insisted, that the people were satisfied, both as to the existence of some grievance and that they posed alteration would afford a remedy they should not support it. Have I shown either? I did, and do object to the manner this question was started, but so far from objecting to the *because* of "its parentage," (although I detest both,) I expressly stated that, respective of the source, from which this question sprung, it certainly is, for us," and earnestly desired its serious consideration.

I thought you were too good a republican, to intimate, that the representative is superior to his constituents; he is the servant, to carry out the wish of his constituents, is I believe, considered, orthodox republican doctrine; rather than to proclaim from high places what the people should do. However, may be, the "discovery" was not made by "a representative;" so far otherwise the "discoverer" had not received, as he was "a representative," the "lights," which "young America" all wards furnished.

In "the best Constitution man ever beheld," is certainly provided the means for its amendment, and may "great admiration for" the wisdom of its framers," is not at all diminished, because they foresaw the necessity for making such provisions; but it certainly does not follow, that because we have the power of making "amendments," that we should exercise it before experience proves it is necessary; if we do, it is furnish no evidence, that "it would be wisely used," much less, that those men gave any such guaranty.

You say the advocates of the measure ("free-suffrage") do not wish to do property of its representative capacity &c.—Can you inform me, of what a freeholder, elected by the "landless" (for they compose the majority,) would be to the freeholders? Do you suppose his 300 acres of land, worth, it may be as many hundred dollars, any restraint to an ambitious demagogue?

You say something about "a system giving fifty acres of land, in many cases equality, by a *professionally* just equal principle, to fifty times its body, and proportionate superiority over the times its value." Here I must confess your fancy has taken a slight, right out of my sight, but from what source, I desire to remind the people of Edgecombe: In 1835, when the question of altering the Constitution, was submitted to them, (although among the alterations, then proposed, was that, by most people deemed much the more republican mode, of electing the Governor by the people, instead of the Legislature;) what was the response from this County? Why nearly unanimously, in opposition; from the election precinct, in which I reside, entirely unanimous. Now what has occurred to convince you, that you were then wrong? Nothing, unless the want of a few thousand votes, in the election of a Democratic Governor, shall be deemed and held to be such an occurrence. Therefore, say to these disturbers of your quiet, that if they cannot manage to be Governors, without destroying the best features of our Constitution; a Constitution made by those at least as able and patriotic as they are, you believe more so; to keep their hands off, as you will see them in ****, before you will consent to it.

The Doctors sometimes deem it best to give their medicine, in "broken doses;" I will try its effect in this case. May 17th 1852. A Conservative.

Dear Sir. After I had written what appears above, I received "The Southerner" containing my communication of the 6th, with your editorial remarks, in the nature of a reply thereto. Deeming it but fair, to be allowed a rejoinder, I proceed at once to make it. Your liberality, in admitting into your columns, communications espousing doctrines and principles, to which you are opposed; your willingness for the people to hear both sides, on all important subjects, deserves, and will doubtless receive its reward. I thank

you for giving the publication, and pleased, that you have replied to it. Will, I trust, prove the means of convincing the people, to give the subject deliberate consideration, which is a decidedly great importance demand. Whether you have "severely" "chained," or proved its strength by "hammering," perhaps remains to be seen. If you had said, that not liking "chain" you had endeavored to make one of your own, you would no doubt have "hit the nail on the head," would advise all who may happen to have law suits, without facts to sustain them, to employ you, as if you could furnish fancy to answer as a substitute I know not who can. The "issues" tempted to make, seem not to suit, as you have so modified them that hardly know their "favor."

you for giving the publication, and pleased, that you have replied to it. Will, I trust, prove the means of convincing the people, to give the subject deliberate consideration, which is a decidedly great importance demand. Whether you have "severely" "chained," or proved its strength by "hammering," perhaps remains to be seen. If you had said, that not liking "chain" you had endeavored to make one of your own, you would no doubt have "hit the nail on the head," would advise all who may happen to have law suits, without facts to sustain them, to employ you, as if you could furnish fancy to answer as a substitute I know not who can. The "issues" tempted to make, seem not to suit, as you have so modified them that hardly know their "favor."

Perhaps your "issues" were more *met* than mine. I stated as a fact, which you have not, and cannot dispute, that this "free-suffrage" question, did not originate with the people, that a grievance exists, & insisted, that the people were satisfied, both as to the existence of some grievance and that they posed alteration would afford a remedy they should not support it. Have I shown either? I did, and do object to the manner this question was started, but so far from objecting to the *because* of "its parentage," (although I detest both,) I expressly stated that, respective of the source, from which this question sprung, it certainly is, for us," and earnestly desired its serious consideration.

I thought you were too good a republican, to intimate, that the representative is superior to his constituents; he is the servant, to carry out the wish of his constituents, is I believe, considered, orthodox republican doctrine; rather than to proclaim from high places what the people should do. However, may be, the "discovery" was not made by "a representative;" so far otherwise the "discoverer" had not received, as he was "a representative," the "lights," which "young America" all wards furnished.

In "the best Constitution man ever beheld," is certainly provided the means for its amendment, and may "great admiration for" the wisdom of its framers," is not at all diminished, because they foresaw the necessity for making such provisions; but it certainly does not follow, that because we have the power of making "amendments," that we should exercise it before experience proves it is necessary; if we do, it is furnish no evidence, that "it would be wisely used," much less, that those men gave any such guaranty.

You say the advocates of the measure ("free-suffrage") do not wish to do property of its representative capacity &c.—Can you inform me, of what a freeholder, elected by the "landless" (for they compose the majority,) would be to the freeholders? Do you suppose his 300 acres of land, worth, it may be as many hundred dollars, any restraint to an ambitious demagogue?

You say something about "a system giving fifty acres of land, in many cases equality, by a *professionally* just equal principle, to fifty times its body, and proportionate superiority over the times its value." Here I must confess your fancy has taken a slight, right out of my sight, but from what source, I desire to remind the people of Edgecombe: In 1835, when the question of altering the Constitution, was submitted to them, (although among the alterations, then proposed, was that, by most people deemed much the more republican mode, of electing the Governor by the people, instead of the Legislature;) what was the response from this County? Why nearly unanimously, in opposition; from the election precinct, in which I reside, entirely unanimous. Now what has occurred to convince you, that you were then wrong? Nothing, unless the want of a few thousand votes, in the election of a Democratic Governor, shall be deemed and held to be such an occurrence. Therefore, say to these disturbers of your quiet, that if they cannot manage to be Governors, without destroying the best features of our Constitution; a Constitution made by those at least as able and patriotic as they are, you believe more so; to keep their hands off, as you will see them in ****, before you will consent to it.

The Doctors sometimes deem it best to give their medicine, in "broken doses;" I will try its effect in this case. May 17th 1852. A Conservative.

Dear Sir. After I had written what appears above, I received "The Southerner" containing my communication of the 6th, with your editorial remarks, in the nature of a reply thereto. Deeming it but fair, to be allowed a rejoinder, I proceed at once to make it. Your liberality, in admitting into your columns, communications espousing doctrines and principles, to which you are opposed; your willingness for the people to hear both sides, on all important subjects, deserves, and will doubtless receive its reward. I thank

you for giving the publication, and pleased, that you have replied to it. Will, I trust, prove the means of convincing the people, to give the subject deliberate consideration, which is a decidedly great importance demand. Whether you have "severely" "chained," or proved its strength by "hammering," perhaps remains to be seen. If you had said, that not liking "chain" you had endeavored to make one of your own, you would no doubt have "hit the nail on the head," would advise all who may happen to have law suits, without facts to sustain them, to employ you, as if you could furnish fancy to answer as a substitute I know not who can. The "issues" tempted to make, seem not to suit, as you have so modified them that hardly know their "favor."